



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/559,022	04/27/2000	REINER KRAFT	AM9-99-0097	2928

22891 7590 03/25/2004

DELIO & PETERSON
121 WHITNEY AVENUE
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/559,022

Applicant(s)

KRAFT ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 and 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21 and 25-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1-1) Claims 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows et al (US Patent 5915251, issued Jun 22, 1999)(hereafter referred to as "Burrows1"), in view of Burrows (US Patent 6021409, issued Feb 1, 2000)(hereafter referred to as "Burrows2").

Regarding claim 14, Burrows1 teaches "assigning a sequential number to each word" (ie., sequential locations of the content...)(col 5, lines 61-67). Burrows1 does not teach, but Burrows2 teaches "search result abstract" (ie., search engine... index abstracts of the web pages)((Burrows2, col 1, lines 54-59).

Burrows1 teaches "determining a zoom level"(ie., subintervals... range based)(col 2, lines 8-37).

Burrows1 teaches "defining a maximum search window based on the zoom level" (ie., intervals, subintervals...range-based)(col 2, lines 8-37)(ie., circle)(col 6, lines 1-5).

Burrows1 teaches "setting a base index... maximum search window"(ie.,index entry...portion of information ... one or more numeric location entries; first word, location... last word)(col 2, lines 1-5; col 7, lines 14-19).

Burrows1 teaches "searching ... base index" (ie., sequential location into words; first word parsed has an associated location "1")(col 5, lines 15-20; col 7, lines 15-20).

Burrows1 teaches "searching ... not an indexable word" (ie., sequential search)(col 7, lines 14-20).

Burrows1 teaches "setting the base index ... subsequent search window"(ie., first word... location "1".. last word)(col 7, lines 14-19).

Burrows1 teaches "displaying a condensed ... search result abstract" (ie., summaries of the compressed data structure)(col 12, lines 27-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Burrows1 to include search result abstract as taught by Burrows2, providing the motivation to present qualified pages located by the search engine to the user and provide a benefit to provide a search engine which can index large databases storing content in a number of different forms where the data structure of the index should be compact in order to reduce the cost of the search engine... a reasonable amount of time and a meaningful manner (Burrows2, col 2, lines 60-67; col 3, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 15, Burrows1 teaches "determining ... search window" (ie., first word of the first page .. location "1".. last word)(col 7, lines 14-19).

Regarding claim 16, Burrows1 teaches "searching for ... indexable word" (ie., binary search) (col 12, lines 52-60).

Regarding claim 17, Burrows1 teaches "setting the base index... subsequent search window" (ie., interval, subinterval which includes the range based values...

representing subintervals ... starting value and the length of the subinterval;
Parsing)(summary, col 2; col 4, lines 39-53).

Regarding claim 18, Burrows1 teaches "setting the base index... when a word at the index is not an indexable word" (ie., interval, subinterval which includes the range based values... representing subintervals ... starting value and the length of the subinterval; Parsing)(summary, col 2; col 4, lines 39-53).

Allowable Subject Matter

2) **Claims 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27 are allowable subject matter.**

3/19/01

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 19-21, Burrows1 teaches "engaging a zoom function," "determining a zoom level.. user computer," "assigning sequential ... result abstract," "initially ... result abstract," "initially setting ... base index," "determining a maximum... zoom level" (see rejection for claim 14 above, using prior art Burrows1, 5915251).

The prior art, Burrows1 in view of Burrows 2, fail to teach the limitations dealing with random window flag setting, determining whether the offset value is greater than the ... skip value and index flag settings. These limitations are not taught, suggested or rendered obvious.

Regarding claim 25, Burrows1 teaches "computer readable program code .. search result abstract," "... for causing... zoom level," "... causing the computer ... one or more words based on the zoom level," "... base index at other words to establish a subsequent search window and searching for indexable words within the subsequent

Art Unit: 2176

search window” and “base index being a focal point of the maximum search window” (see rejection for claim 14 above, using prior art Burrows1, in view of Burrows2).

The prior art, Burrows1 in view of Burrows 2, fail to teach the limitations dealing with first word at the base index being an indexable word and displaying indexable words in accordance with the zoom level. These limitations are not taught, suggested or rendered obvious.

Regarding claims 26, 27, Burrows1 teaches “... engage a zoom function,” “...zoom level,” “... sequential numbers to each word of the ...,” “...initially set a base index at a first word...,” “initially set an offset value ...,” “... maximum search window...” (see rejection for claim 14 above, using prior art Burrows1, in view of Burrows2).

The prior art, Burrows1 in view of Burrows 2, fail to teach the limitations dealing with skip value based on zoom level, index flag being set, obtaining offset value, random window flags, random number with maximum search window having a value greater than negative value... . These limitations are not taught, suggested or rendered obvious.

Other Prior Art

A. Prior art made of record but not cited:

1. Mayer (US 6012057, issued Jan 2000), High speed data searching for information in a computer system.

2. Karten (US 6421662 B1, filed Jun 1999), Generating and Implementing Indexes based on criteria set forth in queries.

3. Hill et al (US 5787424, issued Jul 1998), Process and System for recursive document retrieval.

4. Guha (US 6539373, effective filing data Feb 1999), Contextual searching by determining intersections of search results.

5. Rajaraman et al (US 6366910 B1, filed Dec 1998), method and system for generation of Hierarchical search results.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gautam Sain
Technology Center 2100



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER